5 April 1975

Mr. Douglas R. Leisz
Regional Forester
U.S. Forest Service, USDA
630 Sansome Street
San Francisco, California 94111

Re: 8410(2300) Mineral King Draft EIS

Dear Mr. Leisz:

I fully appreciate and sincerely thank you for taking the time and effort to appear at Humboldt State University and address yourself regarding the Mineral King draft EIS.

The rhetoric may have changed, but it is apparent that Forest Service decision making processes have not. The Mineral King draft EIS is another attempt to perpetuate industrial-age myths; cheap energy, more is better, status quo use of natural gas, electricity, fuel oil, waste production, and sewage manipulation.

There is no mention of innovative thinking or Disney "imagineering," i.e., solar power for water, or space heating; or electricity; recycling (really, 9,900 kg of solid refuse per day is a bit much!), sewage (why only tertiary treatment?), etc.

By superimposing p. 57 on p. 17 one wonders if you have even looked at your own data! Based on these two maps and line 16 on p. 195 you appear to be ignoring your own information!

Why are the Retlaw, Inc. holdings not included as part of Appendix J (p. J-13)!? Seems a bit misleading.

This draft EIS is a basic start toward an EIS, but you have a long, long, long way to go to be able to adequately meet the land ethic intent of Public Law 91-190 of 1969.

The entire statement appears to be another exercise in incremental, "Tragedy of the Commons," status quo planning.

2023.009.0283.a

Adequate consideration of two recent studies is lacking:

Goldman, Charles R., and Thomas A. Cahill. "Danger Signs For Tahoe's Future," Cry California, 10:2, Spring 1975, pp. 30-35; HC/107/C2/C7.

Miller, P., M. McCutchan, and H. Milligan, 1972. Oxidant Air Pollution in the Central Valley, Sierra Nevada Foothils, and Mineral King Valley of California, Atmospheric Environment, Pergamon Press, Great Britain.

These two studies are directly applicable to Mineral King and the MK draft EIS.

A constructive alternative is a "go-light-approach": Ski hut(s) in the Mineral King basin for cross-country skiing and other minimum-impact, relatively inexpensive (emphasis added) snow-play ativity.

The MK draft EIS does not address itself to several viable alternatives (p. 4, VI):

5. Wilderness status for defacto and eligible wildlands in the Mineral King basin.
6. Inclusion in Sequoia-Kings Canyon National Parks.
7. De-development of the Mineral King basin.

Two sentences on p. 213 show that even you are uncertain of your commitment to the Disney proposal for Mineral King:

"Construction of the proposed recreational development at Mineral King does not necessarily consitute an irrevocable land use commitment.....the project represents an essentially permanent land use that commits Mineral King to relatively high intensity recreation use."

Now is the time and opportunity to change the decision-making process as well as the rhetoric. "Tragedy of the Commons," and mistakes can be avoided.

Thank you for taking the time, effort, and expense to consider this response.

Sincerely,

Scott M. Kruse

Scott M. Kruse
1634 West Lansing Way
Fresno, CA 93705
(209) 229 - 1795

Chief of Research
Earth Nat'l Park Eco. Consultants

2028.009.0283 b